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Summary

- Temperance has the image of a rigid and moralistic movement which aimed at total abstinence and with little relevance to the present.

- Temperance in fact had a more varied agenda, including the idea of progressive restriction and modification of drinking.

- Temperance history shows that the issue of cultural change is central. Temperance helped change drinking culture but also built on more general social change. Such cultural change can be achieved in society through avenues like the media, which have changed their attitude to alcohol.

- The local dimension was important for temperance; current licensing reform offers local government and local action opportunities which temperance reformers fought for in the 1880s.

- Women’s changed role in society and greater independence has been under- or misused in the current debate on alcohol by comparison with women’s past role in relation to alcohol misuse.

- The role of religion in achieving cultural change in a multicultural society is also currently underused by comparison with the position religion held in relation to drink in the past.

- Scientific messages are unclear and alliances with criminal justice interests could be more firmly established. An ‘advocacy coalition’ could have greater impact.

- Better public messages are needed, as in the nineteenth century. These could involve a range of drinking options, including abstinence.

- Political division on the drink issue may develop through licensing as it did in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There will be, and are, opportunities for external coalitions to influence developments.

- Temperance interests in the past worked with sections of the drinks trade to achieve moderate reform, and new alliances might be possible in the present, given the changing role of the industry.

- The history of allied policy areas like smoking, where policy has moved through different stages and cultural change has been achieved, offers a model for possible change for alcohol.
If someone refuses a drink at a party, they usually feel obliged to preface the refusal with a disclaimer: ‘Of course, I’m not teetotal, you know’. Temperance does not have a popular image in the early twenty-first century. Most people associate it with outdated attitudes, rigid moralism, narrow religion and an uncompromising attitude towards the consumption of drink. Temperance parties with no alcohol, only fruit juice and crisps do not fit well with the twenty-first-century lifestyle. Temperance is a joke. When I mentioned to colleagues and others that I was working on the relevance of temperance to the present, many were dismissive. It would not take long to do the study, they said, because temperance had no relevance. People now would not adopt a non-drinking way of life or be attracted by evenings spent delivering tracts. But this lack of relevance did not prove to be the case. Although temperance has the image of an outdated creed, it was in fact a movement with a variety of aims. Abstinence was not its only aim and it helped change the culture of drinking in the nineteenth century. It built what would now be called ‘social capital’. It was a movement which was politically important: it was closely tied to the fortunes of the main political parties in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

As the study proceeded, the current politics of alcohol became more prominent. Alcohol consumption and alcohol policy were high profile in the British news media and the political parties began to debate drink and the nation’s drinking culture in a way which evoked the late nineteenth century. The lessons of temperance, its alliances and also its failures did not seem so irrelevant after all, as the rest of this report sets out to argue.

The detailed aims of the project are set out in Appendix 1 at the end of the report. The overall aim was to look at the relevance of the history of temperance to present-day alcohol policy. The methods used were of two sorts: a literature review of published historical analyses of temperance; and a series of interviews with key actors and opinion formers in the present, examining their perceptions of temperance and their views of current policy. Interviewees ranged from civil servants involved with government alcohol strategy and licensing reform to an imam in Camden, representatives of alcohol campaign organisations and medical interests and a journalist. The aim was to get a broad cross-section of those with current interests in alcohol policy. These interviews are used, with permission, in direct quotation in the report and have also been used to inform the comments made about the past and the present. The methods are outlined further in Appendices 2 and 3. The report provides a brief bibliography of key sources referred to, but a fuller listing and analysis is also available (see Appendix 2).

The basic argument of this report is that the ‘real history’ of temperance offers many models for the present, and that politicians, scientists and the drinks industry might do well to look at that history more closely, as some indeed are beginning to do. It also offers examples of missed opportunities which should be seriously considered. The rest of the report makes that argument in more depth.

The report begins by outlining the current policy context and the historical background. It discusses the ways in which the research found that the history of temperance had already informed the views of some key people in the policy field. It then focuses on two key areas:
changing the culture of drinking and the political dimensions of the alcohol issue. In both these major sections of the report, there are suggestions of how the past may inform the present. Temperance achieved cultural change through various levers which could be built upon now – among them the role of women; religion; scientific messages and alliances with criminal justice interests; using education and the media; and local government action. The political possibilities in the present can also be informed by the past. The report stresses the political advantages in alcohol policy; discusses the controversial question of working with the drinks industry; sees a role for international alliances in particular in Europe; and shows how the history of other substances and of cultural change can also offer models for alcohol. The final section of the report sums up the possibilities for the present and the future.
Two areas frame this report:

- the changes over time in the aims and activities of temperance interests
- the current policy issues: the Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy for England (AHRSE) and the Licensing Act and local government.

Changes over time in the aims and activities of temperance interests

People had drunk alcohol in British society since time immemorial but it was not until the nineteenth century that such consumption was seen as a problem in a consistent way. In the context of an industrialising society which needed adaptable, time-aware workers, sobriety became a virtue. Governments increasingly saw drinking as an area with which they should engage. Alcohol consumption was rising and peaked in the 1870s (Wilson, 1940, p. 335). Temperance movements emerged which sought to restrict the use of drink in various ways.

Temperance is often equated in present-day commentary with an attitude of prohibition to the consumption of drink. But, even in its heyday in the nineteenth century, temperance was never a monolithic movement. The early meaning of temperance was simply that of anti-spirits; the first temperance supporters in the early nineteenth century were opposed to the drinking of spirits but not to that of beer. Temperance later changed its stance to one of total abstinence and the majority of its support came from working-class interests. But even within this classic phase of temperance from the 1830s to the end of the century, there were different models of action. Greenaway (2003, pp. 9–19) identifies six models which offered solutions to the ‘drink problem’ as seen at the time. Of these six, four were related to the temperance movement. These were:

- ‘Moral suasion’. The activity of the state should be limited and a crusade should aim to reform the lives of individuals.
- Intemperance and a faulty social order. Drink should be regulated by the state so that working men could achieve a measure of independence.
- Prohibition. Drink was seen as a problem requiring public and political rather than private and personal reforms. Drink was seen as a dangerous drug and the duty of the state was to suppress it.
- Progressive temperance restriction. This position sought a halfway house between traditional licensing regulation and the dogma of prohibitionists through various mechanisms such as heavier or differential taxation or restriction of hours of opening.

By the last decades of the nineteenth century, temperance was allied with politics at the national level through the alliance with the Liberal Party, while the drinks trade was increasingly associated with the Conservatives. The local dimension of political activity was important and the Permissive Bill proposed that different localities could vote on whether they wanted prohibition. This bill was introduced and reintroduced in Parliament without success.
Temperance

from the 1860s. Temperance repositioned itself through the connection with organised religion, nonconformity and the Church of England. It also became part of the ‘condition of England’ question through the researches of social reformers like Charles Booth and Joseph and Seebohm Rowntree. Prohibition gave place to moderate reform and disinterested pub management, which sought to run pubs and refreshment facilities which offered drink and other refreshment in salubrious settings and with no financial incentives for the seller. The role of medical science became increasingly important and excessive drinking became connected with theories of disease and treatment. Women’s drinking was seen as a particular problem at the time, at the turn of the century, when the ‘future of the race’ was of growing concern.

During the First World War, the ‘drink problem’ became part of the drive for ‘national efficiency’ and what could be considered an overall national strategy was put in place for the first time. Pub closing hours (the afternoon closure) were enforced and nationalisation of the drinks trade was considered. State purchase of the trade was enforced in areas like Carlisle and Gretna and a Central Control Board regulated the rest of the trade. But this model of central control was not maintained after the war.

The interwar years were a time when temperance sentiment ebbed and new leisure activities such as sport and cinema-going provided alternative models of entertainment outside the pub. In the years after the Second World War, temperance in the sense of a formal movement on the nineteenth-century model was almost extinct. However, commentators have drawn attention to a ‘neo-temperance alliance’ involving medical and other scientists. There has been the development of an ‘alcohol misuse lobby’ which has increasingly seen itself in opposition to the interests of the drinks industry. Temperance has been associated with health concerns and with the way in which contemporary public health focuses on ‘single issues’ like smoking or overeating. Drink as a single issue fits into those concerns. To some extent the earlier debates on temperance as ‘moderation’ have revived through the discussions of moderate drinking and its effects.

Current policy issues: the Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy (AHRSE) and the Licensing Act and local government

Alongside this résumé of history (which is discussed further in the following sections), there run two current policy issues which have given alcohol matters a high current profile.

The Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy

This long-awaited strategy was published in March 2004 after preparatory work had started in the Department of Health some six years previously. The final strategy was produced from the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit with an introduction by the Prime Minister; an interim analytical report was published in 2003 which contained the ‘evidence base’ for the conclusions. The publication of the strategy was a considerable achievement given the history of such exercises. A previous attempt, initiated under the Labour government of the 1970s, to develop a cross-governmental alcohol strategy was never published and only saw the light of day through publication in Finland.

Although the publication of the 2004
strategy was welcomed, its content also attracted considerable criticism from the public health/medical lobby, which saw it as dominated by the interests of the drinks industry. Medical interests criticised the focus on youth ‘binge drinking’ to the exclusion of other forms of harmful drinking, the failure to consider whole population approaches and the neglect of ‘high impact’ interventions such as increased taxation.

Nevertheless, the strategy is currently being implemented through the National Treatment Agency and through emphasis on better enforcement of laws relating to under-age drinking, among other activities.

**The Licensing Act 2003 and local government**

The Licensing Act, operational in 2005, has changed the current alcohol, entertainment and late-night refreshment licensing schemes into a single licensing system to be managed by local authorities rather than, as previously, by magistrates. Licensing committees of local councillors consider licensing objectives such as the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and the protection of children from harm when looking at an application. Permission to carry on licensable activities is contained in a single premises licence or club premises certificate, valid for the life of the premises. A personal licence is valid for ten years. Applications, if granted, will be effective from November 2005.

The Act has attracted criticism on a number of grounds. Its policy location in the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) after an initial location within the Home Office underlined the focus on the needs of tourism and trade and the aim of introducing a European-style café culture. It liberalised hours of opening and offered the option of 24-hour licensing; licences had to be granted unless a ‘relevant representation’ was made by an ‘interested party’. After pressure it was agreed that it would be possible for licensing committees to consider the cumulative impact of the opening of licensed premises in a particular ‘stress area’. The impending implementation of this Act lay behind the many media stories in the summer of 2004 about youth ‘binge drinking’ in city centres and the worries of local police forces that they would be unable to cope with public disorder which could result.
3 How policy interests saw the history of temperance

Alcohol issues were high priority during the period of this project, and the above policy issues were central. What role did views of the history of temperance play in those policy processes? This section draws on both the interviews for the project and some published commentary. The conventional expectation would be that temperance and its associations with restriction would be used in the debates as a convenient badge with which to brand opponents. Temperance, in short, could be used in a pejorative way, standing for an outmoded past, for fuddy-duddy and killjoy attitudes to drink. Some people did talk about temperance in this way. Jean Coussins of the Portman Group, referring to temperance in Sweden, talked of ‘a regime to control the working class and to control women … They were not able to bear the idea of working people enjoying themselves’ (interview with Jean Coussins).

But several of the project interviewees were aware of the variety and range of options in the temperance past and their relevance to the present. Not surprisingly, some of these commentators came from within the temperance movement or its successors. Andrew McNeill of the Institute of Alcohol Studies saw many parallels between the agendas of temperance in the past and the present-day interests of alcohol policy.

> There’s nothing new … tax, availability, the drinks bill, policies in the workplace, educating young people about alternatives to alcohol … a lot is similar. It’s the temperance book without the hymns.

(Interview with Andrew McNeill)

Many people directly involved in policy were also aware of this history. Andrew Cunningham, the civil servant in charge of the Licensing Bill in the DCMS, spoke of how the history of licensing legislation and the temperance agitation round licensing had informed the proposed changes. His department had wanted to get away from a ‘paternalistic’ past which, by implication, was associated with temperance and its restrictive attitude towards the availability of drink. Simon Milton, leader of Westminster Council, is a historian by training to whom knowledge of the local politics of temperance was significant. The current ‘politics of drink’ at the local level in Westminster had led to the change of leadership which brought him to power. Knowledge of the history of temperance had informed the current policy issues in a sophisticated sense. Temperance and its history had been there in the background.

However, temperance history was obviously not the main animating force behind the policy changes. Yet as this project progressed the importance of that history for current and future strategies became clearer. The history set out themes and strategies which could be built on in the present; and it also pointed to possible missed opportunities for effective action in the past. The report which follows sets out this agenda based on history. It argues that many of the current initiatives and mix of policies have their antecedents in the past and build, often unknowingly, on past attempts to moderate drinking and its associated problems. But it also argues that the past suggests a richer mix of initiatives than is currently in play and
possibilities currently not employed, and that these too should be considered.

The report outlines these possibilities under two main headings:

• changing drinking culture

• political alliances.

Each of these main chapters has subsections which deal with particular aspects of the issue.
4 How to change drinking culture: the lessons from temperance

The change in drinking culture in present-day society is widely recognised. Drink is more freely available, drinking every day is common, and the cultural norms of respectability which used to operate (40 years ago women would not have bought a drink for themselves in a pub) have gone. Getting drunk can be an end in itself, part of a good night out for many young people. Concerns about alcohol-fuelled crime and disorder in city centres have risen and in 2004–5 as the new licensing legislation came into effect there were widespread concerns in the media about public disorder (Panorama, 2004). Such a situation is reminiscent of the past. This section of the report shows how temperance norms helped alter hard drinking culture then, and how some of those strategies could be adapted for use in the present. It considers the options under six main headings:

- how to deal with crime and disorder
- local government and civic culture
- women and a positive role
- religion and a multicultural society
- better scientific messages
- education.

For each theme, it first considers the historical context and then the contemporary relevance, with a final summing up of key messages.

How to deal with crime and disorder

The historical context

By the early years of the nineteenth century, the issue of excess consumption of alcohol began to be defined as a social problem. The processes of urbanisation and industrialisation increased the resort of the working class to alcohol, and drunkenness was more visible in an urban setting than in rural communities. On the other hand, the pub with its warmth and bright lights, its games, newspapers and company, offered a tolerable relief from an otherwise wretched environment. Excessive drinking was, however, incompatible with the more disciplined and regulated nature of a factory-based workforce (Greenaway, 2003, pp. 7–8).

Growing social concern was paradoxically accompanied by the liberalisation of the law on the sale of drink. The 1830 Beer Act allowed anyone to sell beer (not wines and spirits) on the simple payment of an excise fee of two guineas. It established a dual pattern of licensing: full pubs and new beerhouses. The passage of the Act arose in part from a radical desire to undermine the oligarchic power of the local justices and in part from overall laissez-faire principles, ideas of free trade which were so important in the early Victorian period. The measure had an immediate impact with over 24,000 licences taken out in the first six months and 21,000 over the next eight years. It was credited by its opponents with contributing to a great increase in intemperance and disorder among the lower classes. Nor did it appear to
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have improved the quality of the outlets. Nevertheless free trade ideas remained strong into the 1860s. Gladstone’s wine-retailing legislation of 1860 opened up the retail side of the wine trade by allowing grocers and shopkeepers to take out excise licences for the sale of wine in bottles for consumption off the premises and by giving eating houses the right to sell wine with meals.

Free trade in alcohol operated less easily than its advocates had expected, in part for economic and structural reasons. Temperance sentiment grew and aimed to change the culture and practice of drinking. Anti-drink sentiment was initially strong among the aristocracy and middle class: this was as an anti-spirits movement in the 1830s, inspired by American example. The movement subsequently broadened both its membership and its aims. Working-class supporters like Joseph Livesey stressed the need to give up beer as well as spirits. At a temperance meeting on 1 September 1832, seven men of Preston took the pledge as an experiment for a year. The early temperance movement concentrated on ‘moral suasion’, on the development of a mass movement which would lead working men to drop going to the pub and take the pledge not to drink. As the historian Brian Harrison (1971, p. 350) has written, ‘Teetotalism … flourished on the genuine desire for respectability and self-reliance which prevailed within the working class’.

In its initial ‘moral suasion’ version, the temperance movement concentrated upon reformation of the individual rather than state intervention. Temperance advocates acted as ‘missionaries’ for the cause and a temperance culture grew up. The description given by Thomas Whittaker, one of the Preston pioneers, of his activities during a visit to London in 1837 give a sense of the interest and enthusiasm:

In London we are going on gloriously … During the last week I have held nine meetings and distributed 2,000 tracts; and large as London is I hope before long there will not be a soul in it who has not heard of teetotalism … On Saturday morning, I distributed 400 tracts on the Margate steamer; and in the afternoon, accompanied by several friends, went to Greenwich. On our way in the steam-boat we preached up abstinence and the consequence was no intoxicating liquors could be sold, although they cried out ‘brown stout, ale and porter’. We held the first teetotal meeting ever held in Greenwich Park, and a good one it was. Returning home, I distributed tracts and gave admonitions at the dramshops.
(Whittaker, quoted in Longmate, 1968, p. 84)

For those who joined the movement there was a set of organisations inculcating sobriety and abstinence which in turn influenced a wider number in the general population. Harrison has examined the various estimates based on those who joined temperance societies or who read temperance newsletters and tracts whose circulation figures are available. He concludes:

The general impression conveyed is that by the 1860s there existed an influential and literate minority in the country of ‘opinion makers’, numbering well under 100,000 teetotalers. The efforts of this minority affected the personal habits of at least a million adult teetotalers, and probably influenced the conduct of many others who did not join teetotal organisations.
(Harrison, 1971, p. 308)
Temperance societies produced newspapers and tracts in their hundreds of thousands.

In addition there were several hundred thousand child teetotalers in the Band of Hope. Founded in 1847, membership was open to all children under 16 and based on the simple pledge, ‘I do agree that I will not use intoxicating liquors as a beverage’. In Leeds the Band was divided into 16 districts and within a few months 4,000 children had been enrolled. In 1852, 6,000 children crowded into Exeter Hall in the Strand in London for a meeting. Thousands of children were shut out and the press of numbers stopped the traffic in the Strand, while those inside the hall adopted a formal presentation to the ten-year-old Prince of Wales (Longmate, 1968, pp. 123–4).

Although the new teetotal movement had a strongly working-class element among its leadership, the movement was also noticeable for its cross-class support. Nonconformist businessmen and Quakers in particular who had supported the earlier anti-spirits movement could see the value of a disciplined and sober workforce. Some historians have argued as a result that support for temperance was a diversion for the respectable working class, the ‘labour aristocracy’. They had failed to obtain the vote in the 1840s through the radical political movement of Chartism and thereafter turned to movements like temperance which did not challenge the existing social order so dramatically. But temperance was never a unified movement. It was constantly, even in this period, riven by controversy. For example, there were the divisions between temperance societies in the north and the south of England over whether to take the short or the long pledge. The short pledge simply committed the person who took it to abstinence while the long pledge committed the taker to a refusal ever to offer alcoholic drink to guests and visitors (Shiman, 1988, p. 22).

So temperance developed its own internal culture which had mass appeal. But its impact also came at a time when the general culture of drinking was in flux. Some of this change can be attributed to the influence of the temperance movement itself, but there was also a general decline in the earlier culture of hard drinking across the classes. It was no longer acceptable, as it had been in the eighteenth century, for the local squire to fall dead-drunk under the table after a night’s drinking. This decline in consumption became particularly marked towards the end of the nineteenth century. From 1880 to 1914 consumption of beer declined; by 1914 per capita consumption in England and Wales was no higher than it had been in 1840. The latter years of the century were ones of rising real wages but for the first time this extra spending capacity did not go on drink. John Burnett (1999, p. 127) comments that ‘The main reason was not so much the success of the temperance movement or stricter licensing policies as changes in the role of beer in working class life’.

New consumer goods and leisure opportunities were on offer. Heavy drinking and drunkenness were no longer respectable but characteristic only of the lower strata of the working class, the social outcasts. Counter-attractions to drink were offered – allotments, parks and playing fields, sports, libraries, museums and travel. There were physically and mentally improving alternatives to the pub (Burnett, 1999, p. 127).
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Contemporary relevance
This nineteenth-century picture has some immediately obvious parallels with the present: a period of current concern about public disorder; the liberalisation of access to drink; a culture of hard drinking across society. However, there are also differences. Society now has no mass movement focused on individual abstinence as a route to working-class respectability and advancement. There are still memories of the temperance movement and interviewees from temperance backgrounds remembered the culture in its later years. During an interview in Portcullis House with Ross Cranston, the Labour MP who chaired the All-Party Group on Alcohol Misuse, MPs crowded round us to reminisce about their boyhood experiences of temperance. In the past, future Labour leaders like Arthur Henderson, Keir Hardie and Philip Snowden gained their initial political training through temperance organisations like the Good Templars, learning how to control meetings with a training in democracy and public service. However, there was general agreement, even among temperance supporters, that that sort of mass movement and its ethos could in no way be recreated in the early twenty-first century. The cultural context now is different, although politicians do recognise the need for building respect and ‘social capital’ in contemporary society.

The issue of cultural change and how it is achieved, which is highlighted by the history of temperance, is of central importance. The Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy recognises that culture changes over time and that one aim of policy can be to start to change current behaviour and culture (AHRSE, 2004, pp. 12, 53).

Culture is not immutable and the history of drinking shows how different manners and customs and levels of drinking have prevailed at different times. Hard drinking can be a social norm across society, as it was in the eighteenth century, but that culture can change. Society currently shows divergent tendencies – on the one hand there is a move towards greater hedonism demonstrated by the ‘drink culture’ among young people and higher levels of drinking across many parts of society, but on the other hand there are tendencies towards greater puritanism and social concern. These are demonstrated in punitive measures to control public behaviour, such as Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) and drink control zones, and also to compel drink and drug users into treatment such as Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTOs). Either tendency could prevail or become more dominant: the issue of cultural change is important.

History also shows us that the influence of what would now be considered a ‘pressure group’, a non-governmental organisation (NGO) or activist group, in contemporary language, can be a significant force for change. Temperance built up social capital in Victorian society and inculcated attitudes of ‘respectability’ which politicians are seeking to model in contemporary policy. The recent history of health activism since the 1970s shows a different organisational model to that of temperance: small media-conscious organisations, often primarily funded by government (Action on Smoking and Health, ASH, was one early example) rather than the nineteenth-century mass membership model. Like the nineteenth-century organisations, there are currently many in the field, with Alcohol
Concern the most prominent. Pressure group activity is still important.

In the nineteenth century temperance literature was important; in recent times the media is the successor to the ‘information’ disseminated in the nineteenth century. The media can be enormously important not only in defining a public agenda, but also in defining an issue to politicians. Until recently the media attitude to drink had been more tolerant and liberal than that towards drugs. But the recent concern about localised 24-hour drinking and the drain on police resources has brought a change (Rayner, 2004). Given that this issue will continue throughout 2005 and beyond with the introduction of the new Act, the media coverage is bound to continue and will have both public and potential policy impact.

So there are levers here for possible cultural change. There are many entrées for a ‘drink message’ in popular culture. For example, the novelist Ian Rankin, a former alcohol researcher, has one of his characters agree to be the designated driver when they drink in the bars of Edinburgh. There is also the issue of what level of drinking is the overall aim. At the present moment, ‘moderation’ is much discussed and is the ostensible aim of policy, but what moderation means is increasingly difficult to define. Its opposite concept is ‘binge drinking’; this is also a blurred concept but it is one which seems to separate out ‘them’ as drinkers as distinct from ‘us’ whose drinking is not problematic (more on this below in the section on ‘Better scientific messages’). These are not the only models of drinking which are possible and there could be greater clarity in the field.

The core of nineteenth-century temperance was abstinence from drink and this could be highlighted as an option in the present day. Numbers who do not drink are significant and these include young people. Fifteen per cent of people questioned in a recent Office of National Statistics survey had not drunk at all in the past year (Lader and Goddard, 2004, p. 10). Speaking at the Civic Trust alcohol conference in 2004, David Prout, director of local government policy at the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), told the audience that his knowledge of the late-night economy came through his au pair. She was a clubber but also a non-drinker. She is not the only one. Yet this group of non-drinking young people is never acknowledged in any publicity.

‘It’s OK not to drink’ could dovetail with a revised moderate drinking message which is discussed below.

To sum up

- Temperance in its nineteenth-century version cannot be recreated in the present.
- But the culture of hard drinking can be changed, using levers already present in society.
- The role of the media is of central importance.
- Pressure groups have a role to play.
- More thought should be given to a varied public message – defining moderation and binge drinking, including abstinence as an option and building on the numbers of people who do not drink.
Local government and civic culture

The policy changes which have taken place recently place licensing within the control of local government. Licensing reform and the role of local government were also a key issue in temperance history and the present situation offers opportunities which were not open to the temperance movement but which it fought to obtain.

The historical context

Temperance, as is clear from the above discussion, had a strong local dimension. This localism developed as the nineteenth century progressed through attempts to introduce:

- local voting on whether to ban drink
- municipal ownership of the drinks trade
- involvement of local government in licensing.

Local voting on whether to ban drink developed as a temperance aim later in the nineteenth century. ‘Moral suasion’, popular in the movement in the 1830s to the late 1840s, became less important and there were attempts to curb the sale of drink through the law. In the 1860s and 1870s, attempts were made both locally and nationally to introduce prohibition, but these attempts failed. In the 1870s local government became increasingly involved with drink as battles were fought between temperance reformers and drink interests over the issue and conditions of licences for local pubs. The political influence of temperance was recognised by the Liberal Party in 1891 when it made local prohibition a part of its Newcastle Programme. But that programme was defeated in the election of 1895 and its temperance content was partly blamed for the defeat (Shiman, 1988, p. 5).

The temperance organisation which carried forward the case for local prohibition was the United Kingdom Alliance (UKA). This was founded in Manchester in 1853 to work for prohibition in the UK after a law had been passed in Maine in the USA in 1846 prohibiting the sale of intoxicants. The UKA’s aim was to influence policy rather than to reform individuals. Its aim was to free people from the tyranny of drink but through the imposition of an authoritarian solution. Its answer to the criticism of authoritarianism was the strategy of the local veto, which it adopted in 1857. This idea was that local ratepayers in a parish or similar area could vote to go dry; a two-thirds majority would be needed to make the decision binding on everyone in the area. This expanded the idea of prohibition to include localism and democracy (Greenaway, 2003, p. 24). A bill for the local veto, the Permissive Prohibition Bill, was first unsuccessfully introduced in the Commons in 1864, and thereafter was put forward annually. Its champion was Sir Wilfred Lawson, the MP who became the parliamentary spokesman of the UKA. In 1872 the organisation adopted the policy of putting up temperance candidates where existing candidates were weak on prohibition, and in 1878 it agreed to substitute a local option resolution for the Permissive Bill. The relationship of the UKA to national politics will be discussed in Chapter 5 of this report.

This was a period when local politics were important nationally. This localism was at the heart of the changes in the Liberal Party in the 1870s when the Liberal caucus, developed in the
great cities of the north, saw democracy in terms of the will of the people ‘from below’ to formulate policies which the parliamentary leadership was to implement. Local control or local option was one way in which new political sensibilities could be aroused at the local level: local option became an issue for radicals outside the temperance circles. Drink was seen as a broader radical issue with great potential. Arguably temperance interests did not fully capitalise on this situation. The UKA leadership was rigid about its objectives and would entertain little apart from prohibition. The leadership rejected any need for initiatives in relation to licensing reform. Lawson’s answer to those who said ‘Bring in a good Licensing Bill’ was ‘let those bring it in who believe in it’ (Greenaway, 2003, p. 41).

The UKA’s intransigence also led to the defeat of a second local initiative, the attempt to introduce local elected control over drink or to bring the trade under municipal control. Joseph Cowen, the radical MP for Newcastle, introduced a bill in 1876 to transfer all licensing authority to directly elected boards. This would undermine the power of the hated magistracy. Joseph Chamberlain’s proposals in Birmingham went a step further. Chamberlain had already made his mark as mayor of the city by carrying through a programme of ‘gas and water socialism’, the municipalisation of basic utilities. After studying the Gothenburg system in Sweden, where companies of citizens owned and ran the local drinks trade, he proposed a licensing bill which would enable municipalities to abandon licences altogether, issue them to the highest bidder, or run them directly for the benefit of the town’s finances. But the bill was opposed by the Conservatives and the trade and by Liberals who espoused free trade principles, and there was an absence of support from mainstream temperance interests. Twenty years later Chamberlain had not forgotten the rigidity of the prohibitionists, describing the UKA as the greatest obstacle to temperance which Britain had seen (Greenaway, 2003, p. 39).

This episode exemplified the local interest in the last 30 years of the century in democratising licensing. In Bruce’s Licensing Bill of 1871, ratepayers would have been able to help magistrates to determine the needs of the localities. The 1872 Act with its restrictions of closing times led to widespread local dissatisfaction with rioting and demonstrations; Gladstone attributed his defeat at the 1874 general election to ‘a torrent of gin and beer’. The local dimensions of licensing were highly political issues and in the late 1880s and 1890s it was the issue of the number of licences, of over-provision, which became central. Licensing reform was proposed by Liberals in 1888 which would have given control of licensing to county councils and local licensing committees. These would have been composed largely of elected councillors and would have the powers to reduce licences. Licence fees would be increased to form a compensation fund and all existing revenues from drink licences would go to the new councils to provide nearly half their total income. But this reform was not carried through, nor a further Conservative initiative two years later.

**Contemporary relevance**

Such local struggles and the emphasis on local variability and a local solution to the drink issue have many parallels with the current situation over licensing reform. The Licensing Act 2003,
by locating licensing within local government, has carried through part of the temperance agenda of the 1880s. Local government leaders, particularly in London and large urban cities, have criticised the Act. Their criticisms have drawn attention not only to the lack of adequate funding to carry out the work needed, but also to their initial inability to control the overall pattern of licences since the cumulative impact of licensing decisions could not be taken into account. The modifications to the regulations under the Act have taken this criticism into account.

The Act began life in the Home Office but finally emanated from the DCMS and has been defended from that department’s perspective. The drinks trade is a major employer and generator of tourist and other income; the aim is to introduce a European-style drinking culture which will be attractive to visitors and also meet the needs of a younger generation more used to drinking regularly. Opponents have drawn attention to the dangers of ‘binge drinking’ and of city centres becoming ‘no go’ areas.

Temperance interests or their successors have been active in these debates. But other local networks have also taken an interest in the issue and these are not primarily drink related. The Civic Trust took a hand in this and helped to establish the Open All Hours? network; this has lobbied effectively on drink and civic amenity issues. Matthew Bennett, chair of the Open All Hours? network and a Soho restaurateur, commented:

Lobbying parliament is a sophisticated process but ordinary people were left out. We had to protest afterwards … There’s a feeling about anti social behaviour, drugs and gambling and how it will all work out. What sort of society are we creating? The industry won’t pick up the pieces – the taxpayer and government will …

(Interview with Matthew Bennett)

In local ‘stress areas’ too, networks of local amenity groups have taken a stand on the issue. Here is a notice of a typical meeting.

Public meeting Saturday 22 January 2005 … 1.30 p.m. Trinity United Reform Church, junction of Kentish Town Road and Buck Street, NW1 8NJ.

24 hour drinking licences are coming in. Local people are complaining that visitors to Camden’s night time ‘entertainment centre’ don’t live here, urinate in the streets and cause noise etc.

Camden Council is washing sick off the pavements at night … Come to the meeting and find out what is happening.

(Email sent to author, 2005)

Such local networks base their arguments on local amenity and public nuisance rather than drink itself. The drink issue has been given an opportunity to form alliances with other networks with a wider basis of support. The location of licensing within local government thus offers opportunities. It brings licensing and drink directly into local electoral politics and some local government leaders have recognised this. It presents the opportunity for networks of local groups and residents’ associations to take on drink-related issues as a normal part of their activities. The use of scrutiny panels within local government (scrutiny is a device to review executive activity established under new local government arrangements) enables significant local input into drink and licensing matters. For example, Camden Council has already run a scrutiny panel whose report brought together
planning and licensing matters and another panel is current examining alcohol in the borough more generally (London Borough of Camden, 2003, 2004). This is at a time, too, when central government politicians are espousing an agenda of ‘new localism’. The Home Office minister Hazel Blears, in a pamphlet written for the Fabian Society, specifically cited the local influence of temperance as one of those historical manifestations of local power which could be built upon in the present (Blears, 2003).

To sum up

- The changes in licensing law offer an opportunity to build local networks and coalitions in relation to licensing matters. The relationship of drink to other local interests strengthens the case.
- The involvement of local government in licensing achieves an aim under discussion in local politics and temperance circles for more than a century. Despite the deficiencies of the current situation and the greater degree of central government control than in the nineteenth century, local democratic involvement offers great opportunities for those wishing to influence alcohol issues at the local level.

Women and a positive role

Women are centre stage currently in discussions of alcohol consumption. Their role has also been important in the past. There are three main areas where historical interest has concentrated:

- women as ‘innocent victims’ of drinking
- women’s drinking as more blameworthy.

Women were active in the temperance movement and temperance was one of the earliest ways in which women found a role in public life. Although there were local women’s temperance organisations in the first half of the nineteenth century, the main influence came from the United States. The Women’s Christian Temperance Union was of international importance, with influence on other national societies, for example in Australia (Tyrrell, 1983). In the UK, the British Women’s Temperance Association was set up in 1876 and at its height in 1892 had 577 affiliated branches, with a total of 45,000 members (Shiman, 1988, p. 185). Lady Henry Somerset, its leader at the turn of the century, promoted a ‘Do Everything’ policy which brought temperance women into allied political issues such as women’s suffrage. Such a stance was not to the liking of all: her ‘moderationist’ attitude to licensing caused a split in the movement and her resignation in 1903. It was not until the second half of the 1920s that the organisational divisions were healed. However, initially such organisations were important in moving women out of their domestic world into acceptable public work (Shiman, 1992).

Women were also the ‘victims’ of drink, the subject of violence from drunken husbands who spent their wages in the pub. Increasingly, towards the end of the nineteenth century, they too were seen as culpable. Concern about women’s own drinking rose at a time of fear, in the wake of the revelations of physical unfitness at the time of the Boer War, about the ‘future of the race’. The scientific theories of the time
stressed the hereditary transmission of deficiencies and also the Lamarckian doctrine of the ‘inheritance of acquired characteristics’. This was the ‘alcohol gene’ discussion of its time. It was enormously influential across social policy and such ‘eugenic’ ideas stressed the central role of women’s drinking. Such arguments were easy bedfellows for arguments about women’s supposed lack of domestic skills, arguments which were common in other social reforming organisations. The novelist G.R. Sims described graphically how:

It is no uncommon sight in these [public house] places to see a mother wet a baby’s lips with gin-and-water. The process is called ‘giving the young un a taste’, and the baby’s father will look on sometimes and enjoy the joke immensely.
(Sims, quoted in Gutzke, 1984, p. 77)

Such concerns led to legislative action. The 1902 Licensing Act enabled a magistrate to send an inebriate wife to a reformatory in lieu of a separation order, and the Provision of Meals Act of 1903 and Prevention of Cruelty Act of 1904 provided for detention where neglect and cruelty were due to drink. The Act was also used to commit drunken prostitutes and the poorest and most troublesome sections of the male labouring classes. Such sections of society, according to Dr Branthwaite, the inspector of reformatories, ‘bring into the world ill-fed, uncared-for and mentally useless children, who provide the mass from which the future criminal, drunken, and lunatic army is recruited’ (Berridge, 2004, p. 4).

The 1908 Children Act excluded children under the age of 14 from all areas of licensed premises where alcohol was consumed or for sale and such restrictions were reluctantly accepted by the brewers and retailers (Berridge, 2004).

Historians have drawn attention to the fact that the focus on women arose not just from objective realities but also from fears about working-class culture and from changes in women’s role and their greater independence. Research on who was confined in inebriate reformatories shows that more men were prosecuted as inebriates, but institutions were more widely used to confine women (Hunt et al., 1989). Such a mix of influences has continued to mark concerns about women’s drinking. Thom’s (1997) study of the later arrival in the 1970s of women’s drinking on the policy agenda stresses how demand for action arose from different ideological standpoints. A recent study of the rise in importance of fetal alcohol syndrome as a public health issue in the United States also makes the point that such a ‘social problem’ was defined through wider social fears, including those about women’s independence and freedom in the post-pill era (Armstrong and Abel, 2000).

Contemporary relevance
The recent concerns about public disorder have particularly focused on the role of women’s drinking and the rise of a ‘ladette’ culture.

Figures for cirrhosis among young women are rising. This is a change from the 1980s when concern about drinking focused on the male ‘lager lout’. Women as mothers are not of so much interest as they were in the past, but there are still fears of female emancipation, of women stepping outside traditional boundaries. This ties in with the ‘problem with boys’ arguments where women are now seen as more assertive, confident and successful in work and social situations. Some interviewees stressed that there was little potential for an anti-alcohol message
Temperance

directed to women: such messages could be seen as discriminatory. After all, feminists in the 1960s and 70s had argued that women could buy and sink a pint as well as a man; they could hardly criticise women now when they took to drinking as an independent leisure activity. One interviewee commented, ‘We wanted to be different, but women now want to be like men’.

The current situation does offer potential. There could be greater recognition, based on the history, of the double-edged nature of the arguments about women’s drinking. Such coverage recognises a social phenomenon but also runs the risk of giving it too much prominence, of singling out women for blame. Recognition of this could induce more realistic and less fearful public attitudes which in themselves could form part of cultural change.

The links between women’s greater independence and educational attainment now could also be built on more than they are to stress a culture of greater responsibility. In the past women played a leadership role in relation to alcohol, which built on women’s greater education and emancipation at the end of the nineteenth century. Currently there is little coverage of women as social leaders and what there is is often patronising. There are levers for change: for example, the new chief executive of Alcohol Concern is a woman, and a woman politician (Lynne Featherstone of the Liberal Party) has recently spoken on alcohol consumption. Other female public figures could also take a lead.

To sum up
• Concern about women’s drinking is nothing new and has arisen at times of general social dislocation and fear of social change.
• Such concerns recognise a ‘real’ phenomenon but also overemphasise and foreground it unnecessarily. This confusion should be recognised.
• In the past women have played a leadership role in relation to the culture of drinking. Such leadership could be developed in the present, given women’s educational advances and more central role in society which are similar to the advances women made a century ago.

Religion and a multicultural society

Historical context
The nineteenth-century temperance movement had a strong religious dimension at a time when religion was more central in society. Religion interacted with temperance through both moral theology and social reform. Levine (2002) has argued that countries with large and ongoing temperance movements in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were predominantly Protestant societies. The role of religious sentiment in Prohibition in the USA is well known (Burnham, 1968/9; Tyrell, 1997). Harrison also linked temperance in the UK with increased recreation and stressed its secularising tendencies. But some of the earliest temperance agitation came out of religious concerns, for example Father Mathew’s crusades in Ireland, although the many who took the pledge under his influence did not remain with it. The Nonconformist, Quaker and, ultimately, Church of England support for ‘the drink question’ gave
it added weight in Victorian and Edwardian society. The nature of that support changed over time and the relationships between organised religion and temperance were complex. When temperance first began, the churches, accepting the role of social drinking, did not wholeheartedly embrace the new movement. Although Quaker and Nonconformist support was noticeable in temperance organisations, the coming of teetotalism changed the situation between the churches and temperance and caused an estrangement. Many Quakers supported temperance, but they saw nothing wrong in moderation and Quaker families were also prominent brewers in the early part of the nineteenth century. The withdrawal of support of the churches from the movement after total abstinence became the dominant objective also caused hostility on the part of temperance interests. But as Shiman has noted (Shiman, 1988, p. 45), this was a complicated situation. Some churches did identify total abstinence with religion and often there was disagreement between churches of the same denomination on the temperance question. Working-class chapels like the Primitive Methodists and the Bible Christians strongly supported temperance, while mainstream Methodism was more divided. The Salvation Army took the anti-drink message directly onto the streets and religious leaders also campaigned against the influence of drink and music halls.

Greenaway (2003) has pointed out, in a discussion of the changing attitudes of the churches and of nonconformity, that there were two ways in which the churches interacted with the drink problem: as a moral question and as a social and economic issue. This division is useful for considering the relationships between religion and temperance. Schmidt (1995) has drawn attention, in the US context, to the role of temperance as an expression of a ‘crisis of contested authority’ in the Protestant denominations in the nineteenth century. A new theology focused on religious salvation through the suppression of vice; it supported public crusading activities which ultimately came to focus on intemperance. This was a new kind of effort to assert the authority of religious ideas in the public sphere and to regroup religious forces under auspices outside the church.

Similar changes can be seen in the UK. Olsen (1994), for example, has pointed to the changing attitude of the Church of England in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The Church of England Temperance Society was established in 1873 with a dual motive: it promoted teetotalism among the majority but affirmed the legitimacy of moderate drinking among the British medical and social elite. The traditional Catholic stance was that drink had its place and that use and abuse had to be distinguished. Officially the Roman Catholic Church regarded drunkenness as one of the seven deadly sins but drunkenness was not the sin of the drink but of the drunkard. Cardinal Manning’s work for temperance from the 1860s gave the cause a cachet in Catholic circles; he carried out active teetotal work in his ‘League of the Cross’. Harrison (1971, p. 169) concludes that by the 1860s teetotal progress was being made in all denominations: ‘In all the denominations, the men of the future were by now becoming teetotallers.’

There was a gradual coming together of temperance and organised religion by the 1870s. However, Harrison argues that this alliance
brought long-term dangers for both. It ultimately downgraded the role of religion as a prerequisite for moral progress; for temperance it narrowed the movement’s focus and made it more ‘respectable’ and professionalised. In addition, debates over the issue of the use of fermented or unfermented wine in the sacrament caused divisions in the Church of England, which decided in the 1880s that it would not, as temperance supporters had urged, allow the use of unfermented wine in the sacraments.

So, although the connection of religion and temperance in terms of both moral theology and agitation for social reform was strong, it was complex and changed over time.

**Contemporary relevance**

Does this history have anything at all to say to the present? In contemporary society, the religious denominations which exerted such sway in the nineteenth century have lost their public support. Church and chapel attendance is declining. Allied movements such as Sunday observance have little public support. The religious input into the alcohol issue, along with the ‘mass movement’ model, appears to be another aspect of ‘old-fashioned’ temperance.

Andrew Cunningham of the DCMS drew attention to the paradoxical role of organised religious interests in the Licensing Bill discussions. The Church of England could have a major impact on discussions and policy when it chose. But this influence had been exerted only once – over the proposal in the bill that concerts in churches serving alcohol would not be exempt from the requirement to obtain entertainment licences.

The Church rose as a body … it was seriously influential …

(Interview with Andrew Cunningham)

Such events were exempted from the requirements of the Act. According to Stephen Orchard of Westminster College, this was ‘straining at the gnat but swallowing the camel’. The churches contributed very little to the debates on licensing in part for fear of appearing ‘old-fashioned’. Alcohol was not part of the ‘social responsibility’ strand of religious thinking.

It’s not discussed much now, it’s the ‘old morality’ – we must move on to international peace and world trade …

(Interview with Stephen Orchard)

It seems unlikely currently that mainstream and influential religious organisations will take on alcohol as a central issue. Campaigns on baby milk and the food companies are seen as a more ‘modern’ issue. But alcohol could be a relevant issue in terms of Christian religion if the churches chose to link it with local action or the radical side of religious activities, through trade, or the developing world, or the role of women.

In this sense, the religious heritage of the historic mainstream UK churches is hampering their current initiatives. But is that perhaps for the best? Echoing Harrison’s historical comment, the theologian Dr Norman commented that churchmen applying religion to politics might succeed only in reflecting the prevailing fashions of the secular world (quoted in Greenaway, 1984). There are moves to develop a ‘new theology’ which takes attitudes to alcohol on board and this could in turn
impact on religious culture in the same way that new initiatives did in the nineteenth century (Cook, 2004).

The influence of other religions in British society on alcohol has been neglected in discussion. Jewish temperance and abstinence combined with an ability to use unfermented wine as part of religious ritual and ceremony was often referred to as a model in the ‘future of the race’ discussions at the end of the nineteenth century. It was argued then that different attitudes to the use of alcohol contributed to the better health of the Jewish population (e.g. Marks, 1991; Heggie, 2005). Muslims generally do not drink and try to maintain this stance in British society. Joynal Uddin, a community activist in West Euston, spoke of how religious classes after school for young people and direct supervision of their life as students at university helped to maintain norms of abstinence (interview with Joynal Uddin). Such cultural differences are little emphasised in any public discussion of alcohol, perhaps because they raise sensitive issues. School health education which is discussed below acknowledges this religious diversity but there is little discussion elsewhere. Nevertheless, such religious attitudes could be built on in the public discussion of abstinence which this report suggests and in a wider consideration of levels of alcohol use and non-use and how different patterns of drinking could coexist in society.

**To sum up**

- The historic British religious organisations, the churches, have had little impact or interest in the drink question in recent times. However, their influence at the policy level, if exerted, could be substantial.
- Reordering of moral theology in relation to drink is taking place and may lead to a revised church interest in alcohol as a public issue.
- Other religions in British society have more active attitudes towards drink and abstinence, yet these are rarely currently acknowledged or built upon as part of a range of publicly discussed options.

**Better scientific messages**

**Historical context**

It is often forgotten that temperance had a strong scientific component. The scientific side of temperance manifested itself historically in two ways:

- moves to establish a state-funded treatment system
- scientific discussion about the effects of alcohol.

The role of medicine within temperance became important in Britain and other countries towards the end of the nineteenth century. In both Britain and the USA ideas grew that the excessive consumption of alcohol was a disease and this was accompanied by the rise of a medically based movement to do something about alcohol. The medical temperance movement aimed to stop the use of drink as a medicine but it also had wider legislative aims. It wanted the provision of medical, state-funded treatment for what were then called inebriates.
The intention was to divert these ‘habitual drunkards’ out of the ‘revolving door’ of prison and into treatment. The rationale was that drinkers were diseased. Modern scientific research had revealed:

‘that intemperance has a physical and pathological as well as a legal, moral and spiritual aspect, that there is a gospel of the body as there is a gospel of the soul …’, so stated Norman Kerr, the President of the British Society for the Study of Inebriety, in an 1893 lecture on Inebriety and Jurisprudence.

(Kerr, quoted in Berridge, 1990, pp. 999–1000)

Doctors like Kerr, who were also temperance supporters, organised and lobbied for a state treatment system. The classic punishment for drunkenness at this time was a fine, or imprisonment for several weeks or months. Numbers imprisoned had risen rapidly, from 4,000 in the early 1860s to 23,000 in 1876. There were moves to reform this process and to insert a medicinal component. In 1870, Donald Dalrymple, Liberal MP for Bath, formerly a surgeon in Norwich and proprietor of the Heigham Lunatic Asylum, introduced a private member’s bill to that end. It was unsuccessful, but in 1872 a parliamentary select committee on the control and management of habitual drunkards, of which Dalrymple was chairman, urged the need for legislation to bring about the compulsory treatment of voluntary patients and of convicted drunkards. The results were initially disappointing. In 1879, the Habitual Drunkards Act opened up compulsory treatment for non-criminal inebriates who could pay. A further Act followed in 1888, and the 1898 Inebriates Act allowed the committal of criminal inebriates to state-funded reformatories if they were tried and convicted of drunkenness four times in one year. The power to compulsorily detain non-criminal inebriates, long advocated by medical reformers, was never granted. Financial battles between the Home Office and the local authorities, charged with rate-funding the reformatories, bedevilled the implementation of the Act. Further plans to extend the law failed. Even before the First World War, the inebriates legislation fell into disuse. Only 14 reformatories dealing with 4,590 inmates were in operation. Drinkers and drug takers fell within the ambit of lunacy and mental deficiency legislation as alternative ways of keeping them out of the hands of the law.

It is also important to remember the historic connection between these medical moves and criminal justice agendas. The Inebriates Act initiatives typified the mingling of medical science with crime and disorder concerns. The probation service, the organisation which came to link criminal justice with rehabilitation, also had its origin in temperance, in the temperance missionaries who appeared before the police courts to ‘reclaim’ drunkards who appeared before them (Jarvis, 1972).

Tying in with these policy-related medical initiatives were scientific discussions, often inspired by medical temperance, of the effects of alcohol on the body (Berridge, 1990). The eugenic and hereditarian ideas which had fuelled late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century medical science were falling out of favour by the time of the 1914–18 war. Medicine, however, was not the only form of science within the temperance movement. Temperance economics drew attention to the wastefulness of expenditure on drink. Every year, the publication of the National Drink Bill drew
attention to both the direct and indirect costs of drink. But, as Dingle (1977) has noted, temperance economics came to be seen as outmoded because the temperance interests refused to take on board the newer social analyses which drew attention to broader problems of poverty. In 1911, with fears of war increasing, the Church of England Temperance Society’s publication *The Economics of the Drink Problem* pointed out that the money spent on drink could be used to buy more firepower:

> The sum spent on intoxicants in the year would purchase Seventy-five ‘Dreadnoughts,’ and leave a balance of over Seven Millions Sterling. Perhaps, however, the most striking comparison of all is contained in the fact that every penny spent on the Navies of the seven First-class Naval Powers of the world amounts to £120,810,435; or, in round numbers, Thirty seven Millions Sterling less than the United Kingdom spends on what is the chief cause of poverty, sickness and crime. (Johnson Baker, 1911, p. 57)

The restrictions on drinking imposed during the First World War marked the height of scientific influence over policy making. But this was a different type of science. Physiological studies of drinking and its effects funded by the newly established Medical Research Council fuelled the arguments about the relation between alcohol consumption and industrial efficiency. In the interwar years scientific effort focused also, with some temperance influence, on the development of physiological measures of alcohol consumption like the blood alcohol test, which was to be important for drink-driving. Some historians of American alcohol research during the interwar years have claimed that the earlier association with ‘scientific temperance’ made scientists wary about engaging with the area; and that science tended to minimise the harms of alcohol because of the earlier temperance associations (Pauly, 1994).

**Contemporary relevance**

Both these themes – the policy influence of science and debates about the effects of alcohol – have been important post-1945, but seem to have been less influential in recent times. The policy lobby has continued. Commentators have drawn attention to the rise of a ‘neo-temperance alliance’ round drink in which science has played a key role. This international coalition of researchers first came together in the 1970s. The publication of their original manifesto, *Alcohol Control Policies in Public Health Perspective*, known as the ‘Purple Book’, began scientific advocacy based on epidemiologically focused research (Baggott, 1990; Thom, 1999). This scientific stance has produced publications such as *Alcohol Policy and the Public Good* (Edwards et al., 1994) and the recent *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity* (Babor et al., 2003). The scientifically driven coalition has advocated a whole-population approach to alcohol problems rather than the disease focus popular just after the Second World War and in the 1950s and 1960s. It has been concerned to bring alcohol into a closer relationship with mainstream public health concerns: historians have commented on the separation of alcohol from the public health movement in the nineteenth century because of temperance influence. The science has also broadened to include areas such as economics, important historically within temperance. It has generally been critical of industry influence on alcohol policy: one interviewee commented that
medical interests had been more evangelical than the churches on the drink issue.

This lobby appears to have had less influence in recent times and its ‘public face’ has also lost visibility, with some notable recent exceptions. The pre-Alcohol Strategy publication of the Academy of Medical Sciences’ report Calling Time and the media coverage of criticisms by alcohol researcher Robin Room and others of the Alcohol Strategy and the Licensing Act gave this alliance greater public visibility. But some interviewees for this research commented that the medical and scientific sector seemed currently less well networked by comparison with the public order lobby which was driving alcohol policy. It may be for this reason that there was disappointment in the medical field with the content of the Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy because of its failure to deliver on the treatment side of medical concerns and because its preoccupation with ‘binge drinking’ meant that chronic alcohol problems elsewhere were neglected. However, the movement towards national standards for treatment and the inclusion of alcohol in the National Treatment Agency and in local Drug Action teams shows some progress.

The connection with criminal justice interests which is so marked a feature of health in relation to drugs currently is also a developing feature of the alcohol field. ASBOs can apply to alcohol offenders with treatment as part of the package and there are long-standing arrangements for diversion into or through probation departments for alcohol offenders. However, the criminal justice element of such packages is currently dominant, for example in the proposed drink-banning orders and other policy initiatives like drink-control zones. There is little public discussion of health in relation to these policy initiatives.

The scientific message about alcohol now has to be promoted to the public and the clarity of the public message has become blurred by recent developments. In the 1980s the ‘unit strategy’ promoted by medical interests and by government seemed to give a clear message. But that message has become less clear as time has gone on. There has been public acknowledgement by some of those involved in drawing up the unit strategy that there were only ‘back of the envelope’ calculations in the first place; the government report Drinking Sensibly in 1995 changed the measure to daily units and appeared to be raising permissible levels; and also the increase in size of bar measures has not helped. Professor Sir Michael Marmot, who chaired the Academy of Medical Sciences committee, commented that the scientific message about alcohol was different to that about smoking. With alcohol the issue of moderate use and its health benefits also served to blur public perceptions of science (interview with Michael Marmot). This is a debate with historic roots, as we have seen above.

The public message from science has also been confused by the concept of binge drinking and what that means. Binge drinking used to mean what down-and-out drinkers did. But it has widened as a concept, in part after it was rediscovered by public health epidemiologists in Eastern Europe (McKee et al., 2001). This has modified the traditional public health population approach. It has high public visibility but tends to drive a wedge between them (young people who drink too much) and us (who may also drink but whose drinking is ‘moderate’). It emphasises ‘high risk’ drinking,
Alcohol science does not have the broad coalitions which have operated for other substances or in the past; coalitions with criminal justice interests could open up the issue and bring the issue of the burden on the health service and on families more centrally into some of the debates.

**To sum up**

- Science and medicine, with overt temperance connections and as a ‘neo-temperance alliance’, have played important roles in policy making both in the nineteenth century and in more recent history.

- Science is still important, as recent controversies make clear, but the scientific influence on policy has been less strong, in part for political reasons, in part because of the blurred nature of the scientific message. Both ‘moderation’ and ‘binge drinking’ need clearer definition. It is important to firm these concepts up and also to discuss the possible health benefits of abstinence and low-level or irregular drinking.

- Alliance building, for example with the public order lobby, or the development of a science-based pressure group or coalition could be a way to gain greater influence. An alliance with criminal justice interests would build on the role of temperance in the origin of the probation service and also through the Inebriates Acts in the past.

**Education**

**Historical context**

Like all nineteenth-century movements for improvement, temperance placed great emphasis on education and information. A flood of temperance tracts and newspapers appeared. In 1861 William Tweedie, the temperance publisher, affirmed that there were three weekly newspapers with a united circulation of 25,000, six monthly magazines with a united circulation of over 20,000 and two quarterly reviews with a joint circulation of about 10,000. In addition there were two periodicals for young abstainers: one the Scottish Adviser with a circulation of over 50,000, the other the Band of Hope Review, with a circulation of over 250,000 (Harrison, 1971, p. 308).

More formal temperance education came in schools in the early 1900s. In 1909 the Board of Education issued a ‘Syllabus of Lessons on “Temperance” for Scholars attending Public Elementary Schools’. The use of this syllabus and later revised ones was not compulsory but it contained what Wilson (1940, p. 255) called ‘a very careful survey of the effects of alcoholic indulgence on the physiological, social and economic life of the individual and the community’.

Aside from such formal educational intervention those, especially young people, who took part in temperance organisations, belonged to temperance friendly societies and attended temperance meetings and rallies were involved in a whole culture of non-drinking, which also managed to provide recreation and fun. This was recreation and education at the
same time. The Band of Hope and its public marches provided a whole world for young people. Derek Rutherford, of the Institute of Alcohol Studies, who grew up in the temperance movement, remembered the attractions in an era of rationing, of ‘jelly and ice cream’. This was what the meetings initially meant to him.

**Contemporary relevance**

Such a cultural context has gone. The vehicles for education are now different. The Public Health White Paper outlined an agenda for co-operation with the Portman Group, the organisation representing part of the alcohol industry, to bring education to young people, in particular those over 16. The Group itself sees this as a central part of its role. Sarah Maclean of the Department for Education and Skills commented that in school education now, drugs, alcohol and tobacco are brought together in the science part of the national curriculum, and that different cultural attitudes to drink are also acknowledged.

Whether education has an impact on behaviour has been much discussed in the health promotion field and elsewhere. In the temperance movement, those concerned with alcohol education are thinking in new ways. George Ruston of Hope UK, the present-day successor to the Band of Hope, spoke of the need to use informal networks of influence, to plug into alliances like the environmental movement and to learn from marketing strategies used by the alcohol industry. He pointed out that delivering face-to-face education might not be the best or only option. The need to shock, long discounted as counterproductive, is being reassessed in the light of recent smoking campaigns and the apparent success in securing reduced transmission of sexually transmitted diseases of the much derided national AIDS campaign of 1987. The role of TV programmes and public figures who do not drink or who have concerns about alcohol (as the non-smoking comedian Roy Castle’s lung cancer was used in the passive smoking debate) is currently under-exploited.

The ‘information culture’ of the early twenty-first century is far removed from the nineteenth-century pamphlets. The media is an important force now – in setting the agenda for the public, and for politicians. In an interview for this project, Jo Revill, health editor of the *Observer*, commented how women’s magazines had played an important role in putting health more centrally in their coverage and how alcohol had shot up the media agenda over the past year and a half. The public interest in such issues and in problems of disorder and crime had coincided, for health correspondents, with a lessening of stories about problems in the NHS. Public health issues like obesity and alcohol had emerged on an equal footing with health service stories.

As media analysts have often observed, such coverage not only moulds but also reflects public interests and attitudes. It is important too in setting issues on the political agenda. Revill, in her interview, mentioned some key issues for the media. These covered public order (binge drinking and the Licensing Act) and also the scientific evidence (the Marmot report [Academy of Medical Sciences, 2004]‘gave everyone some meat’). This gives a clue to the sort of alliances which might feed into the developing media agenda on alcohol. The
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Emergence of gambling liberalisation as an issue has added another aspect to potential coverage – as has the proposed partial prohibition of smoking in pubs promised in the Public Health White Paper. Alcohol-related items are likely to remain important in domestic news coverage as the Licensing Act is implemented. Obesity is another issue with alcohol potential since drink also piles on weight. The connections which could be made with the food (food and drink) agenda have not so far been exploited. So media coverage should continue to expand.

To sum up

- Education and information were central components of temperance in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
- Formal education is likely to achieve little without wider policy and social change.
- However, educational initiatives do offer possibilities. School education brings together alcohol with drugs and smoking and acknowledges different cultural attitudes to drinking. Industry has formed alliances with government on post-16 education on drink.
- Temperance organisations are considering innovative ways of disseminating knowledge. The role of TV series and of non-drinking public figures with appeal is underused.
- The role of the media is of central importance in defining public and policy agendas. Conditions are ripe for further change and development in media coverage of alcohol.

This section of the report has considered the important role of changing culture and the different engines of cultural change both historically and in contemporary society. But politics and policy are also central; and to this aspect the report now turns.
Political alliances and possibilities

Historical context
Temperance was a national movement in the nineteenth century, but initially was not allied with one or other of the main political parties of the time, the Liberals and the Conservatives. In 1862 a pro-temperance bill was supported by 48 Liberals and 47 Conservatives (Shiman, 1988, p. 218). It was not until the UKA decided to take direct action that a division on party lines began to take shape. At the 1872 election, the UKA asked candidates whether they would support the Permissive Bill and gave the answers wide publicity. Temperance interests turned increasingly to the Liberal Party. By the mid-1890s, after Liberals had adopted the temperance programme, interests that supported drink turned to become associated with the Conservatives.

These political alliances were not as simple as they seemed and produced complex tensions which were reflected in the political debates on local option and also on licensing. This section surveys the peak of those debates from the 1890s until just before the First World War. This period saw the emergence of a divided agenda within temperance and also new attitudes towards drink as a political issue within the Liberal Party. The main vehicle of the political alliance was the UKA and its prohibitionist policy of local veto. Licensing was a key political issue of the time. By the mid-1890s it was clear that prohibition was not a vote winner for the Liberal Party. The Conservative victory in the 1895 general election was widely ascribed by the drinks trade to have resulted from its influence, although not all agreed. The Liberals attributed their defeat to poor leadership which had led to issues like local veto (local prohibition of the sale of drink) assuming unwarranted prominence. Local veto bills introduced in the 1890s by the party had not given political advantage. Increasingly the party politics of drink became bound up in the wider political issues of the 1890s such as Home Rule, the rise of socialism and imperial defence. By adapting puritanical policies on drink, the Liberals seemed to be alienating many valuable working-class voters.

The divisions within the Royal Commission on Liquor Licensing and its majority and minority reports produced in 1899 added to the confusion. The Liberal repositioning after the defeat of 1895 involved major problems in relation to temperance interests. Local veto was frightening off influential party backers, including retailers like the Gilbey firm, and was not popular with the electorate. Political calculation among the new Liberal leadership played a major part in determining what should be its policy on temperance. As Dingle observed, ‘For almost thirty years Liberal leaders had bemoaned the lack of unanimity within the temperance movement but by the end of the century they were actively encouraging it’ (quoted in Greenaway, 2003, p. 66). The last thing they wanted was the appearance of thraldom to a united temperance front.

The possibility of a united front was diminishing because temperance itself was developing two distinct political agendas by the turn of the century. In terms of the intellectual climate, the UKA position of prohibition was
under challenge from a number of directions from the 1880s. The writings and investigations of social scientists like Charles Booth and of social reformers like the Webbs and Joseph Rowntree linked drink with wider arguments about poverty and social reform. Socialist ideas were spreading and led to new ideas about the role of drink. Some socialists, like Philip Snowden, saw prohibition and temperance as useful auxiliary engines in the battle against poverty. Others, like the Fabians, saw the answer in collective control by the people of a dangerous traffic, through municipalisation (Greenaway, 2003, p. 57).

Such ideas also spread within the parliamentary ranks of temperance supporters and a divided agenda emerged. The Liberal temperance MP Whittaker led a faction which had links to others like Rowntree, Sherwell and Lady Somerset and which drafted a new and wider programme based around the idea of disinterested management (a system whereby those who sold alcohol had no pecuniary interest in its sale). A programme of reform emphasised the raising of compensation money from the trade, wide powers of local self-government, disinterested control and a system whereby adequate counter-attractions to the public house would be developed and maintained. Local veto was a possibility in this programme but was left in a subordinate position.

Such ideas were violently opposed by the prohibitionist section of political temperance and the movement entered the twentieth century divided into two bitterly warring factions. The UKA has been criticised by historians for its failure to compromise and to take control of the possibilities inherent in this wider programme. Whittaker and his supporters could not win the day in terms of Liberal Party support because of the existence of significant pockets of local veto support, in particular in Scotland and Wales. A canny political initiative could have used the moves to introduce restrictionist reforms. But the Alliance supporters were too intransigent to do this – or to adapt to the new discourse of social reform.

Drink reached the high point of party political controversy in the years between 1902 and 1914. It became one of the major areas of conflict between the parties and contributed to the constitutional crisis of 1909–11. The initial impetus came from the activities of magistrates at the local level who began to reduce licences as part of a move to force reduction and redistribution out of urban areas. It had been widely argued that there were excess numbers of ‘on’ licences in urban centres and that such places were insanitary drinking dens where the publican pushed alcohol on the customer. The magistrates’ new militancy in the early twentieth century caused alarm in the trade: brewers had sunk large sums in tied houses. The subsequent 1904 Licensing Act was a debt paid by the Conservative government to the trade: the party had had no independent desire to reopen the licensing question. The Act provided for safeguards, including a compensation fund which was to come from a levy on all licensed properties and was to be administered on a local basis. New licences were exempt from the scheme but were to pay a high licence duty.

It was the Liberal Party’s attempt to reverse the provisions of this Act through the 1908 Licensing Bill, and the rejection of that bill by the Unionist majority in the Lords, which led to the...
the constitutional crisis. One-third of retail drink outlets in the country were to be closed; compensation was for a time-limited period of 14 years at the end of which full monopoly value was to transfer to the state. Opposition focused on the threat to property and confiscation, seen as the precursor of socialism and nationalisation. But Lloyd George, that adept political operator, was not at all fazed by the failure of the bill. He saw taxation as the way forward and as a way of getting the party political advantage in the wider issue of tariff reform. As Greenaway comments, ‘Lloyd George had grasped the interlocking nature of the taxation and social reform questions and saw the budget not as a mere fiscal device but as a political opportunity’ (Greenaway, 2003, p. 85).

The sharply increased drink-licensing duties were also a backdoor way of reducing outlets. The 1909 Budget, which linked drink taxes to land value taxes, was a way of arousing working-class enthusiasm for Liberalism and cementing a progressive alliance with traditional nonconformist radicalism.

Local veto was finally enacted, but only in Scotland through a 1913 Act. Few in either political party cared about it much either way any longer.

Contemporary relevance
Do the complex political scenarios of a century ago have any relevance to the present? They could well do, given changing circumstances. The drink issue is again focused on licensing reform, although it is now liberalisation rather than reduction of licences as it was a century ago. The political configurations are also different. The Act is being promoted by a Labour government; political opposition at the local level has come from both Labour (Camden) and Conservative (Westminster) councils. Simon Milton, leader of Westminster Council, commented that this was far from the traditional Conservative image of close links with ‘the trade’ (interview with Simon Milton).

At this local level, concern about the expansion of late-night licensing and the increase in the number of premises has had political advantage: Simon Milton became leader of Westminster Council on an agenda of opposition to the council’s then policy on the late-night economy. Milton’s view on the political future was that the national parties would compete at the next general election but one (the interview took place before the 2005 general election) partly on the issue of alcohol and controls, possibly in alliance with sympathetic sections of the trade. The impact of the Licensing Act could lead to a backlash, and also to problems for the industry with a growth in capacity and oversupply of licensed premises which would have to compete on price. In the 2005 general election, the Conservative Party used the licensing issue and alcohol control as part of its London manifesto. Dame Jane Roberts, Labour leader of Camden Council, saw a political future at the local government level for issues like alcohol: local government’s future role lay in part in the regulation of behaviour. She saw the alcohol issue as part of a spectrum of community safety interventions at the local level – including ASBOs and dispersal orders, which have proved popular with local communities (interview with Jane Roberts).

It is clear from these comments, which are ‘of the time’ when they were made, that there are emergent political possibilities in the drink issue which have not been present for some
time. The Labour Party’s attitude to the drink issue historically was divided – the party had advocates of temperance, nationalisation and liberalisation. It remains to be seen how this legacy will play out in current politics. Charles Clarke, the Home Secretary, has held talks with chief constables, holding out the olive branch of more funding to aid city centre policing at weekends. This could defuse police opposition to the Act, since the police originally supported licensing reform and moved to oppose when promises of extra resources did not materialise. Behavioural control measures at the local level, including alcohol dispersal zones, could help defuse public opposition to the Licensing Act changes. More recently the Liberal Party has taken up the issue, stressing the impact of alcohol on health services. Alcohol now has political potential for all parties at both local and national levels.

To sum up

- Drink became a political issue between the 1870s and the outbreak of the First World War with temperance allied to the Liberal Party and the trade in alliance with the Conservatives.

- Political interest came to focus on licensing and its restriction.

- The political alliances round the issue were complex and politicians’ interests in drink were linked with wider political agendas. A new social discourse of poverty and social reform also informed thinking on drink.

- The rigidity of prohibitionist temperance interests prevented a broad coalition of moderationist interests on drink gaining political weight.

- Taxation began to be used as a levy on drink by astute Liberal politicians like Lloyd George.

- At the present time, there are again political possibilities in the licensing issue. These are developing at the local level and may also transfer into national politics through the main parties.

- It would be possible for coalitions of interest outside government to influence such developments, although other political considerations will always determine whether politicians support them or not.

Working with industry

Historical context

The mention of coalitions brings us to further historical developments at the national policy level. The following section surveys what happened politically to temperance and politics during the First World War and after and it identifies strategies and alliances, some of which were successful. It also identifies avenues which were not fully followed and which could be rethought in the present.

The nature of drink control as an issue changed during the First World War to one of drink and the national effort, to drink and ‘national efficiency’. The controls put in place the equivalent of a national alcohol strategy. The creation of the Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic) (CCB) initiated a more active governmental interest in alcohol policy. Lloyd
George’s original plans for nationalisation of the drinks industry gave way to more moderate measures through the CCB, which was established in 1915. By the beginning of 1917, 38 out of 41 million inhabitants of the UK lived under its control. It was the Board which introduced the ‘afternoon gap’; sales hours for ‘on’ consumption were reduced to five and a half hours in almost all scheduled districts. A policy of dilution of spirits was gradually enforced. ‘Treating’ (buying drinks for others) in public houses was prohibited to deal with the problem of servicemen being plied with excessive numbers of drinks. The chairman of the CCB, Lord D’Abernon, brought a fresh mind to the drink question. Its work emphasised research, the role of drink in relation to food, and occupational and industrial issues. The CCB extended its work through the purchase of the trade in munitions areas, of which Carlisle was the most prominent. Although further state purchase was indefinitely postponed, the wartime policies offered the model of a national alcohol strategy.

The restrictions had their impact on consumption and related health problems. Both beer and spirit consumption fell markedly and convictions for drunkenness were down, as were deaths from cirrhosis (Smart, 1974; Greenaway, 2003, pp. 111–12). The wartime restrictions played their part, as did the more general trend towards lowered consumption since the 1890s and the growth of alternative leisure facilities. The trade could also see that it could increase profits even when consumption levels decreased. The future lay in rationalisation of assets and the creation of better facilities for a more discerning market.

The wartime initiatives were not continued in peacetime despite the desire of D’Abernon and his supporters for a constructive alcohol policy. Greenaway cites changes in the political landscape; the growth of bureaucratic politics meaning that individual departmental policies became more important; the growth in political astuteness of the trade; and the divisions and lack of political ‘nous’ of the temperance movement. There were opportunities in this situation, but no group or alliances really seized them. The restriction on hours, however, was enshrined in the 1921 Licensing Act. In 1928, D’Abernon lamented this failure to appreciate what the wartime strategy had achieved and its future potential.

neither of the parties interested – neither the temperance party nor the drinks trade – have shown any indication in their speeches that they understand what has been discovered and accomplished. Temperance reformers denounce as they denounced in 1914; trade orators reiterate their speeches of 1750.

(D’Abernon, 1928, p. vi)

The interwar years were marked by declining drink consumption but also by initiatives centred round co-operation with the trade through ‘disinterested management’ and the ‘improved public house’. Before the First World War, disinterested management had attracted support from temperance interests who had turned their backs on prohibition and the local veto. There had been various attempts at implementation, for example through the People’s Refreshment House Association and the Public House Trust Companies headed by Sir Edward Grey of Falloden. After the war,
Carlisle offered the opportunity to develop disinterested management more fully. In the trade too, there was enthusiasm for improving public houses so that they offered better facilities and food. Whitbread set up a special Improved Public House Company to manage the catering and other demands of the new public house and donated pubs as part of an experimental programme of the Association for Restaurant Public Houses in Poor Districts in the 1920s and 1930s (Gutzke, 2005). The next Royal Commission on Liquor Licensing which reported in 1931 saw these types of improvement as central. But its recommendations were ill-timed in policy terms at a time of overall financial crisis.

Later post-war drink-related initiatives which were successful did build coalitions with other interests. Here we can instance the attempt by the post-war Labour government to have state control of the drinks trade in the New Towns; and in particular the introduction of the breath test for drink-driving in the 1960s which saw temperance interests involved, but in relation to a whole host of other factors. Drink-driving gained support because it was defined as road safety, where there was support for greater restriction, rather than drink control, where the trend was towards liberalisation.

The post-1914 period offered avenues, so historians have argued, which were not fully taken. Divisions in the temperance movement prevented full support for the concept of the improved public house and opportunities could have been taken to work more widely with the trade. The trade was never as united as it might have seemed to outsiders, and some historians (e.g. Weir, 1984; Gutzke, 1989) have argued that the influence of the trade was overestimated by anti-drink campaigners. On the other hand it demonstrated the new style of policy making involving departmental bureaucracies and the ability of drink issues to achieve policy salience if allied with other matters of public concern.

**Contemporary relevance**

Such a history invites reflection in relation to initiatives in the current situation. The AHRSE is in some respects the inheritor of the CCB: both offered a national strategy for drink. The improved public house is again on the agenda. The new policy initiatives stress voluntary responsibility on the part of the industry. The recent dropping of the ‘happy hour’ is part of the trend towards more responsible promotions. Organisations like the British Institute of Inn Keeping offer a professionalising model for the trade with qualifications in aspects of running pubs and their management. ‘We’re trying to soften our image’, said Stephen Thomas, Chief Executive of Luminar Leisure, a late-night theme bar venue provider, speaking at a Civic Trust conference. Thomas spoke of the Luminar five-point plan. This entailed: a minimum price; dispersal policies; a nominated driver receiving complimentary soft drinks through the evening; the availability of water and coffee; and other drinks increased in price (Civic Trust conference, ‘Calling Time’, 2004). Government has told the trade that they have to put their house in order; and the Home Office campaign in the summer of 2004 on under-age drinking showed disturbing numbers who were under age being served.

Local authorities, too, may develop ideas about best practice as their responsibility for licensing develops. A research project carried out by QA Consulting and reported at the Civic...
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Trust conference showed fragmentation with relatively few local authorities taking action on minimum pricing or the capacity of venues. There were eight relevant pieces of legislation which could be applied but fragmentation and lack of knowledge at the local level – at that stage – about what could be done. Such knowledge and ideas about ‘best practice’ will emerge.

The trade itself, as in the past, is not as unified as it might seem. Jean Coussins of the Portman Group spoke of the difficulties in getting united action since the restructuring of the trade which had separated the brewers from the retailing end:

The pubco [the retailing chains which operate drinking establishments] didn’t exist ten years ago. Some pubcos are conscious of social responsibility issues … they use the proof of age cards, others don’t. The summer sting campaign with the Home Office showed the proportion of pubs still selling to children was shocking. There’s the threat of statutory regulation … The new Act may up the ante if the local authorities use their powers … The brewers had a strong sense of community … if the pub chain is owned by German banks or Japanese companies, they’re retailers and only want to take money.

(Interview with Jean Coussins)

Only one member of the Portman Group, Scottish and Newcastle, had any pubs left; to some extent the brewers were ‘between a rock and a hard place’. They spent money on advertising to make the brand visible and then took the flack when retail cut-price promotions led to ‘binge drinking’ publicity. The sense of fragmentation came across also from other interests in the trade who spoke of the need for a single trade association to bring together the confusion of interests (Civic Trust conference, 2004). There was a need to diversify the market, to bring back a range of drinkers. Some chains are clearly seeking a new role and looking at how the trade may develop in the future.

To sum up
- Historically there were missed opportunities to capitalise on an overall drink strategy after the First World War, in part because of the divisions among temperance interests and the astuteness and unification of the trade.
- Some co-operation was achieved in relation to the moderationist agenda of improving public houses.
- Temperance achieved greatest success subsequently with issues like drink-driving where drink was allied with other policy issues.
- There are elements of this situation at present. Voluntary improvement and regulation of drinking environments are on the agenda as part of a harm reduction strategy.
- The drinks industry/trade, despite its image, is fragmented after restructuring. Opportunities exist for coalitions of interest in particular at the local level.
- The success of drink-driving as a policy issue after the Second World War suggests that ways forward could be through more specific issues (like crime or public order currently, or a revival of drink-driving policy, or health service
issues such as cirrhosis deaths or accident and emergency costs) which have public salience and policy visibility.

Learning from other countries

Historical context

Temperance was an international movement and this manifested itself in a number of ways. There were close links between temperance reformers in North America, Scandinavia, Australia and the UK. The growth of medical societies dealing with inebriety was also marked by a good deal of international exchange, in particular with the United States. International alcohol conferences were held in the latter decades of the nineteenth century: in 1878 the first international alcoholism congress was held in Paris. In 1906 the first international association was set up and located in Lausanne, where, as the International Council on Alcohol and Addictions (ICAA), it still sits. But alcohol was never a serious candidate for overall international regulation. The closest approximation to international effort was in the African-based regional control arrangement arrived between the parties to the General Act of the Brussels Conference of 1889–90 and included in the anti-slavery provisions of the Act (Bruun et al., 1975).

Politicians like Chamberlain looked to overseas examples like the Swedish Gothenberg system for new ideas. Prohibition on the US model was never a serious candidate for overall policy as in the USA after the First World War, but the success of the American reformers certainly encouraged the British prohibitionists to continue with their intransigent stance.

Contemporary relevance

The international dimension is still relevant to the alcohol issue, although alcohol does not have its international convention like illicit drugs, which is regulated through the United Nations, or the more recent World Health Organisation (WHO) Tobacco Framework Convention. The influence of models translated from one country to another is still important – ‘binge drinking’ was first discussed in recent years in relation to Russian mortality figures and this had an impact on British policy discourse. However, not all influences take root in the domestic situation. American puritanism on drinking ages and other forms of restrictive culture does not seem to be translating wholesale into the British situation. Models now tend to come from Europe, and both industry and anti-drink interests are developing European coalitions: ILSI (International Life Sciences Institute) for the industry, and Eurocare and a new European Alcohol Policy Network for the anti-alcohol interests. Given the importance of Europe in securing action against tobacco this could be a significant avenue for the future.

To sum up

- Temperance was an international movement and international networks are still important for alcohol. In future, policies and action in Europe will be important and may lead to international conventions as for drugs and tobacco.
Learning from the history of other substances

Historical background
The connections between temperance movements and agitations opposing the use of other substances were historically close. Temperance supporters were also involved in anti-opium agitation, although in general this tended to be opposition to the Indian opium trade with China rather than opium consumption within the UK (Berridge, 1999). Joshua Rowntree wrote *The Imperial Drug Trade* (Rowntree, 1905) to attack this connection, rather than from any concern for the domestic situation. The connections between drinking and drug taking were strong in the emergent treatment field through the discourse of inebriety and common treatment facilities. Some temperance societies were also anti-tobacco and some, in the nineteenth century, even included smoking in the pledge (Harrison, 1971).

Contemporary relevance
The connections with other substances continue and also offer possibilities. Recent policy through both AHRSE and the concern for crime and disorder has brought alcohol and drugs more closely together, in particular at the local level and through the connections with diversion from the criminal justice system into treatment.

The example of smoking and its cultural marginalisation since the 1950s also offers food for thought. Cultural change (the declining use of tobacco) has been accompanied by different modes of policy – from co-operation with industry initially when smoking was a normal activity, through to harsher restriction and opposition to industry as the cultural significance of smoking has declined. Tobacco activism is now the inheritor of the nineteenth-century total abstinence model of temperance, but it started from a harm reduction position in the 1950s and 60s (Berridge, 2003). Can this history of stages in culture and policy change offer a model for alcohol?

To sum up
- Developing connections between alcohol and illicit drugs through diversion into treatment build on historic moves to do the same thing.
- The recent history of smoking shows that cultural change is achieved over a long period of time through various means; staging of policies is possible; and different alliances, including those with industry, may be appropriate at different stages of cultural change.
6 Conclusion: implications for policy

So the past offers plenty of food for thought for the present. This report argues that the history of temperance is relevant to current and future policy at three levels:

• The current debates often unwittingly reuse arguments and take positions which come from temperance and the drink issue of the nineteenth century. The following concerns all echo nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates:
  – crime and disorder
  – out-of-control women
  – whether alcohol use is good for you or not.

• There are missed opportunities in the present because the real history of temperance is forgotten or misused. For example:
  – the role of women could be used more positively
  – religion could also be built on in a multicultural society
  – there are potential alliances between medical and scientific and criminal justice interests
  – there are opportunities for wider democratic involvement offered by licensing reform.

• Temperance itself and its political and scientific supporters missed strategic opportunities in history or failed to achieve certain aims. These are now again on the agenda. Issues here are:
  – the enhanced role for local government in licensing
  – the political possibilities in the drink issue
  – the potential for working with sections of the industry.

History does not repeat itself, but we can see similarities between the early twenty-first century and the 1830s, the period of free trade and beerhouse expansion. This led to the huge growth of temperance, of sentiment which was deeply critical of the results of free trade. Temperance cannot be revived in its nineteenth-century version, but there are opportunities and policy options in the present situation which its history throws sharply into focus.
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Appendix 1
Aims of the project

The aims of the project as originally set out were:

• to relate the history of temperance and historical interpretation to the concerns of current and future policy making

• to conduct a literature review of the secondary literature on temperance since the nineteenth century, primarily in the UK, taking into account the broad range of temperance activity and the changing nature of temperance over time

• to produce an analysis of this literature which focuses on the questions it raises for current alcohol policy making and strategy

• to conduct a series of interviews with ‘key actors’ in the alcohol field, informed by this literature review, to lead to contemporary conclusions about policy directions

• to produce a report and other publications which link the historical questions and issues with an analysis of current options.
Appendix 2
Historical literature review

There is a considerable secondary literature on temperance emanating from historians and others. In recent years there have been international conferences on the history of alcohol in which temperance has figured. There is an Alcohol and Temperance History email network and also a journal, the *Social History of Alcohol Review*. These bibliographical sources were utilised and contact made with leading historians of alcohol who provided suggestions for ‘key readings’. The library of the Institute of Alcohol Studies provided a central location for much of the literature. That library also has an unrivalled collection of primary source material (temperance journals and books, Royal Commission reports, pamphlets, lectures and speeches). Time did not allow these to be used in detail in this project, but they would be valuable for an in-depth research project.

The potential bibliography derived from these sources was followed up in other libraries: the library of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, the British Library, Senate House Library and the Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine. The PubMed database was also used. A separately funded visit by Virginia Berridge to the History of Medicine Division, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Washington, USA, uncovered material which was difficult to locate in UK collections.

The literature search was carried out by Suzanne Taylor and the literature was assessed by Virginia Berridge. The aim was not only to cover key interpretive writing on temperance in its heyday of the nineteenth century, but also to analyse how temperance concerns and ideologies changed over time, how temperance networks were reconstituted and how the practical politics of temperance changed. The literature review encompassed the twentieth century and the period after the Second World War as well, a period when temperance concerns took new forms.

What was considered to be good historical work on these periods and activities was included in an EndNote database which is one of the products of the project. The key articles were copied and notes were made on books and other sources. These are included in the database which can be searched by topic.

Topics included as key themes – and which are discussed in the course of the report – include:

1. change over time in the aims of temperance
2. culture and temperance
3. the role of women
4. the role of pressure groups in politics
5. religion and temperance
6. relationships between temperance and the drinks industry
7. local dimensions of temperance
8. science and temperance
9. temperance education
10. international dimensions of temperance
11. relationship of temperance and alcohol policy to other substances and their histories.
There are 1,170 entries in the database, including primary material, and 214 secondary articles and books were used. This database is one of the outputs of the project and can be accessed for research purposes either on application to the Centre for History in Public Health at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (www.lshtm.ac.uk/history) or at the library of the Institute of Alcohol Studies.
Appendix 3

Interviews

Twenty interviews were carried out by Virginia Berridge with those with interests in current alcohol policy or with connections with temperance organisations and their history. These were:

1 Civil servants involved in current alcohol policy, the Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy and changes to the licensing law
   • Carol Sweetenham, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, formerly of the Cabinet Office Strategy Unit
   • Andrew Cunningham, Department of Culture, Media and Sport
   • Sarah Maclean, head of PSHE and Citizenship Team DfES

2 The drinks industry
   • Jean Coussins, director of the Portman Group
     (See also Civic Trust conference below)

3 Politicians
   • Ross Cranston MP, chairman of the Commons All-Party Group on Alcohol Misuse

4 Local government
   • Dame Jane Roberts, leader of Camden Council
   • Cllr Simon Milton, leader of Westminster Council

5 Local community interests
   • Matthew Bennett, chair of the Open All Hours? network

6 Religious groups
   • Revd Professor Stephen Orchard, head of Westminster College

   • Revd Professor Chris Cook, personal communication
   • Joynal Uddin, imam and community organiser, West Euston Partnership

7 Temperance organisations with current interests in the alcohol question
   • Andrew McNeill, Institute of Alcohol Studies
   • Derek Rutherford, Institute of Alcohol Studies
   • George Ruston, Hope UK

8 Medical, public health and scientific interests
   • Professor Sir Michael Marmot, University College London
   • Professor Griffith Edwards, National Addiction Centre
   • Dr Gillian Tober, Leeds Addiction Unit

9 Alcohol policy researchers
   • Dr Betsy Thom, Middlesex University
   • Professor Rob Baggott, De Montfort University

10 The alcohol voluntary sector
    • Eric Appleby, then Director of Alcohol Concern

11 The media
    • Jo Revill, health editor of the Observer.

The coverage of interviews was not intended to be fully comprehensive given the timescale of the project, but simply to provide a ‘snapshot’ of the views of some key interests at the time the research was taking place.

The interviews were open ended and focused on the interviewee’s perception of the
history of temperance and its relevance to the present, and on key themes in the present which the review had identified as being important and how they might be translated into a policy agenda. These interviews were taped and notes were also taken. Permissions were given according to the ethical criteria agreed through the LSHTM ethics committee at the outset of the project.

In addition the project work coincided with a period of intense media interest in alcohol-related public disorder which added to the richness of the material which was gathered. Virginia Berridge also attended a conference in 2004 organised by the Civic Trust jointly with the drinks industry, ‘Calling Time’, which provided a valuable insight into the views of some key alcohol providers.

A talk based on the draft report was given at the AGM of the National United Temperance Council in May 2005 and at the Prevention Research Center University of California at Berkeley in June 2005: the views and comments of both audiences were helpful.